Specifically, agreement was reached that the hypothetical combination of Pietrowicz et al., Uchida et al. and Cohn did not disclose or suggest the feature in claim 1 of "an **arbitrator** configured for selecting, from the display <u>requests</u>, the display *element* for each corresponding display area" or the feature in claims 13, 25, and 37 of "selecting display *elements* to be displayed within respective distinct display areas ... based on **arbitrating** the display <u>requests</u>" as specified in independent claims 13, 25, and 37.

As noted during the interview, the claimed display requests are not simply display data, because the claimed "display *elements*" are selected for display based on arbitrating the "display <u>requests</u>"; further, the specification defines "requests" as "commands": see, e.g., page 7, lines 12-13 ("commands (i.e., 'requests') that specify GUI operations to be performed") and page 9, lines 1-2 ("application-based commands (i.e., 'requests') 32").

The rejection of claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-35, and 37-47 under 35 USC §103 in view of Pietrowicz et al., Uchida et al. and Cohn in the February 7, 2006 Final Action is moot in view of the foregoing. Claims 12, 24, 36 and 48 are allowable in view of their respective dependencies.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-469, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: April 28, 2006

Response After Final filed April 28, 2006
Appln. No. 09/955,129
Page 2